



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

*Ch*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/01/89 12:14:31 BERGEH 3 SARNOFF

LM02/0225

WILLIAM J BURKE  
LAW AND PATENT OPERATION  
SARNOFF CORPORATION  
201 WASHINGTON ROAD CN 5300  
PRINCETON NJ 08543-5300

EXAMINER
----------

PADMANABHAN, K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2772

DATE MAILED:

02/26/00

*9*

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

## Interview Summary

Application No.

08/970,889

Applicant(s)

Russell et al.

Examiner

Mano Padmanabhan

Group Art Unit

2772



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mano Padmanabhan

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Eamon Wall (39414)

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Feb 22, 2000Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Agreement ☐ was reached. ☐ was not reached.Claim(s) discussed: None

Identification of prior art discussed:

Adelson, Yeo and Shibata

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The Attorney for the applicant went over the Shibata reference and explained how it differed from the invention, and how it failed to bridge the gap between the invention and the prior art of record due to Adelson and Yeo. Examiner assured Mr. Wall that while she saw his point, she would probably have to review the response when it arrived, including probably a further search for applicable prior art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

MARK K. ZIMMERMAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.